



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,542	09/15/2003	Michael R. Zucchini	P00910-US1	2270
3017	7590	03/08/2004	EXAMINER	
BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, LTD. 101 DYER STREET 5TH FLOOR PROVIDENCE, RI 02903			SWIATEK, ROBERT P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3643		

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,542	ZUCCHINI, MICHAEL R. <i>116</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert P. Swiatek	3643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-15,17 and 18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 7 and 16 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-24-03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (US 2003/0145564 A1). The Chang publication discloses a stirrup assembly including top plate 98, mounting plate 14, foot plate 46, and screw fasteners 112a, 112b extending from the bottom surface of top plate 98 through the mounting plate 14 and foot plate 46.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang. Although the material from which top and mounting plates 98, 14 of Chang are constructed is not disclosed, use of aluminum would have been obvious to one skilled in the art wishing to reduce costs and minimize weight.

Claims 3-5, 8, 9, 12-14, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Cargill (US 6,062,007: Ref. no. 13 on e-IDS). The top plate of the Chang stirrup is not knurled or milled to improve its traction (though it does have traction-enhancing dimples 110) nor does the stirrup construction include a compressible pad and a top plate with notched ends. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, however, to replace the traction dimples 110 of Chang with a knurled, milled surface to increase its gripping capabilities, to provide a compressible pad between top plate 98 and foot plate 46 of Chang to enhance the shock dampening properties of the stirrup, and to employ notches in the ends of plate 98 of Chang to reduce unwanted movement of the plate, all in view of the patent to Cargill (see elements 29, 31, 42, 44 of Cargill).

Claims 7, 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 1, “is provided” should be deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 1, line 3, the phrase “related to and claims priority from” should be changed –a continuation-in-part of–.

Appropriate correction is required.

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: It lacks the date of execution.

The patents to Williamson (US 283,310), Berbaum (US 1,639,073), and Bischeltsrieder (US 3,905,179) have been cited to provide additional examples of stirrup structures.

RPS: 0703/308-2700
2 March 2004

Robert P. Swiatek

ROBERT P. SWIATEK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3643